

Minutes Academic Policy Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY, HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13TH, 1969, AT 2.30 P.M. IN ROOM 609 OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING.

180. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING:

The Minutes of the meeting held on January 30th, 1969, having been circulated were approved with the following amendments:

Page 1, Minute 170, second paragraph:

"human ecology" should read "human evolution".

Page 3, Minute 171, paragraph 6, "Professor Stansbury stated that the Subcommittee on International Studies was not a court of first instance and should be used only for referrals." This sentence should be deleted.

Page 7, Minute 174, second paragraph, "Professor Stansbury stated that the Faculty of Arts and Science ... a term for applying to any one department," should be deleted.

Page 7, Minute 175, second paragraph should read:

"He stated that the present requirement for the general degree stipulated that a student must have three different science subjects the first, second and third year: two of these are continuation subjects and the third one can be a different subject, each year as far as the regulations are concerned."

Page 8, Minute 178, first paragraph should read:

"It was agreed that all reports from Faculties not containing recommendations be circulated to members of the Academic Policy Committee but that they not normally be given on place on the agenda."

181. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES:

At the request of Dean Solin, the Committee agreed to change the order of business and discuss item (c) before items (a) and (b).

(c) *Motion by Mr. Grey on advanced undergraduate programme:*

Dean Solin reported that he had not met with Professor Pounder and Mr. Grey yet to discuss this matter. He said that a meeting was being planned for February 14th and that he would be ready to report at the next regular meeting of the Academic Policy Committee.

The members of the Committee agreed that Dean

ITEMS FOR THE GAZETTE

The GAZETTE is published weekly throughout the academic year. Deadline for submitting items for publication is Monday of the week prior to the week of publication. Materials for the GAZETTE should be forwarded to the Editor, Harry E. Thomas, Rm. 630, Administration Building.

GAZETTE SUPPLEMENT

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 20 3 MARCH 1969

MINUTES—Academic Policy Committee (Meeting of February 13)	42
EVENING DEGREE PROGRAMME	44
STATEMENT FROM STUDENT SENATORS	44
ALLEGIANCE OF STUDENT SENATORS	45
UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION	45
POLICY FOR UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE	45
ACADEMIC ANNOUNCEMENTS	46
A & S POSITION ON CEGEPs	
Oliver-Pounder proposal	47
J. C. Weldon arguments	47

Solin be asked to report at the next regular meeting of the Committee to be held on February 27th, 1969.

(a) *Proposal to explore the techniques of interdisciplinary, problem-oriented learning:*

The Chairman invited Professor Salzman to address the members of the Academic Policy Committee. Professor Salzman stated that he had been considering for some time the setting-up of a programme in Human Ecology along the lines of the proposal now envisioned, but that he had nothing concrete to offer at the moment. He said that he had met recently with the members of the Committee on Human Ecology and that only two members (one from the Department of Genetics and another from the School of Architecture) had agreed to participate in a programme in Human Ecology. Professor Salzman stated that the proposal now before the Academic Policy Committee seemed very interesting.

When asked if this type of programme existed elsewhere, Professor Salzman replied that there was a similar programme at Columbia University.

A discussion then followed and the Committee agreed that Professor Salzman be commended for his approach and that the Chairman of the Academic Policy Committee be asked to continue following this item up.

(b) *Professor Lambek's proposal on the location of Computer Science:*

On behalf of Professor Stansbury and himself, Professor Yates provided an historical summary of developments relating to the proposed School of Computer Sciences.

At the request of the Chairman, Professor Lambek presented his proposal.

Dean d'Ombain was then asked to put the point of view of the Faculty of Engineering before the Academic Policy Committee.

Both Dean d'Ombain and Professor Lambek expressed their reservations about locating the School of Computer Sciences in the Department of Mathematics and in the Faculty of Engineering respectively.

Dean d'Ombain stated that he had given a great deal of consideration to this matter. He wanted to see linking appointments taking place and this was impossible if the question of the location of Computer Sciences was not settled.

Dean d'Ombain felt that Computer Sciences should not be located in the Department of Mathematics any more than it should be in the Department of Electrical Engineering; but to place it in a Faculty was different, he added. If a choice were to be made between the two Faculties (Arts and Science and Engineering), Dean d'Ombain felt that the Faculty of Engineering should be selected. He said that it was well known in computer areas that McGill University had one of the best computer centres in North America and that this was due chiefly to Professor Thorpe. He stated that he wanted computer sciences to develop right across the whole university.

Dean d'Ombain and Professor Lambek then replied to a number of questions posed by the members of the Academic Policy Committee.

Professor Yates asked: (1) whether McGill had a

programme in computer sciences, (2) whether McGill offered a degree in computer sciences and (3) where the students came from. Dean d'Ombain replied negatively to each of these questions stating that such a department did not exist at McGill.

Professor Lambek argued that the original ideas relating to computing always emanated from mathematicians.

Professor Rosenthal asked how the Faculty of Engineering envisaged satisfying the needs of the students from the Faculty of Arts and Science who would require the services that the Department of Mathematics now offers. Dean d'Ombain replied that nothing would stop the students from the Faculty of Arts and Science from taking courses if the School of Computer Sciences were located in the Faculty of Engineering.

A discussion took place as to whether the School of Computer Sciences should come under the supervision of the Vice-Principal (Administration) or of the Vice-Principal (Academic). Professor Oliver felt that the Computer Centre should have a university-wide home. He saw some advantages in having Computer Sciences as a teaching department having university-wide functions and being under the direction of a Vice-Principal rather than a Dean.

Dean d'Ombain saw nothing wrong with computer sciences being under a Vice-Principal. He emphasized that computer sciences was not a service but rather an academic discipline. He felt that McGill should have a School of Computer Sciences with a Head, responsible for the operation of this School. No Dean should influence this person on how to run his department. He added that the key point was the man to be chosen for this job and that to locate Computer Sciences in a department would be wrong.

Professor Dawson felt that McGill University should model itself on M.I.T. At M.I.T. Computer Sciences is centered in the Research Laboratory of Electronics and has no ties with any department: it is a separate institute. He said that one important thing to keep in mind is that interplay is permitted and fostered in various disciplines. He felt that Computer Sciences should be free to the entire scientific community.

A discussion concerning the provision of courses for undergraduates took place.

Professor Wisenthal suggested that Computer Sciences become a part of the Department of Higher Education.

Mr. Niederhoffer wondered whether it would be possible to set up a new Department of Computer Sciences with its budget being jointly handled by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering.

Professor Oliver said that the best solution would be a department, with no barrier and reaching into all parts of the university, i.e. the existence of some university-wide structure. Historically, he added, Faculty have sometimes constituted barriers in this university.

Reference was made to the Bio-medical Unit, a body located in the Faculty of Engineering and being under the joint jurisdiction of the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and Dean d'Ombain was asked whether he

would like to see this kind of academic structure extending to a bigger operation.

Professor Theall suggested postponing a decision on this matter until after consideration of the Yaffe report. He felt that it would be useful to the Committee if some information concerning the location of computer sciences schools and computer centres elsewhere could be obtained from the people now present. Dean d'Ombraïn said that this would be a difficult question to answer since the location usually depended on the person who had initiated the effort. Professor MacIntosh suggested specializing in the kind of School that would make McGill's reputation in this field. He added that the best input would be in the choice of a Director. He suggested that two things be kept in mind, (1) the requirements for a broadly-based level of competence, (2) choosing the very best people who will make the University famous in this line.

Professor MacIntosh asked Dean d'Ombraïn if he thought the kind of recruitment that could be done was contingent on the kind of Faculty home.

Mr. Hister suggested that a decision along the lines that Vice-Principal Oliver suggested, i.e. the setting-up of another department that would serve the entire university be kept in mind.

Dean d'Ombraïn stressed the urgency of this matter. Professor Theall stated that the Academic Policy Committee did not intend to delay a decision very long. He suggested, however, that the Committee delay a decision for one week at which time the Yaffe report will be considered.

Professor Oliver then MOVED that (1) the location of Computer Sciences be in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for the interim; (2) the Academic Policy Committee set aside for the moment Professor Yaffe's recommendation that the location of computer sciences be within the Faculty of Engineering, and (3) the Academic Policy Committee make a decision on this matter after consideration of the Yaffe report, i.e. the Academic Policy Committee is to decide on this item next week.

This motion, seconded by Professor Stansbury, was voted upon and carried.

182. CREATION OF A JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE AND OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT ON STUDENT HOUSING:

The Chairman reported that at a recent meeting of the Senate Committee on Development, it was felt that there was a relationship between housing policy and academic policy. He invited Mr. Hirst to speak to the Committee.

Mr. Hirst said that there were many areas where the question of residence overlapped between the Academic Policy Committee and the Senate Committee on Development. He added that a motion had been presented to Senate requesting that an independent committee be set up to look into this, but at a recent meeting of the Senate Committee on Development, it was decided that this matter be brought up before the Academic Policy Committee.

Professor Oliver stated that the Senate Committee on Development had already approved the idea of a joint subcommittee. This joint subcommittee would report both the Academic Policy Committee and the Senate Committee on Development.

Professor Roseborough wondered what were the terms of reference of this subcommittee. Mr. Hirst replied that the terms of reference had not yet been discussed. He suggested the following:

1. to better enable the University to encourage accommodations in the vicinity of the university;
2. He added that the joint subcommittee would consider matters like how does the accommodation of staff, graduate students and students affect the educational balance at McGill.

Mr. Niederhoffer asked whether the membership of this joint subcommittee had been specified.

Professor MacIntosh then MOVED that the Aca-

ademic Policy Committee approve the proposal in principle and that the Agenda Planning Subcommittee of the Academic Policy Committee be asked to select the members of this joint subcommittee. This motion was seconded by Professor Stansbury.

Prof. Stansbury stated that the questions raised by Mr. Hirst were similar to the ones raised by the Committee on Student Disciplinary Regulations. Professor Yates suggested that the joint subcommittee, before reporting to the Academic Policy Committee and the Senate Committee on Development, consult with the Senate Committee on Student Disciplinary Regulations.

Professor Stansbury suggested that the joint subcommittee be composed of people from the Senate Committee on Development, people from the Academic Policy Committee, and one person from the Committee on Student Disciplinary Regulations. Professor Oliver suggested rather that the Academic Policy Committee recommend to the joint subcommittee that it consult with the Committee on Student Disciplinary Regulations.

The motion was then voted upon and carried.

183. ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTER-UNIVERSITY MARINE ESTABLISHMENT:

The Chairman read a letter which had been passed on to him by the Principal. He suggested that the Academic Policy Committee take notice of this matter and delay a decision until the Committee has had a chance to meet with Professor Dunbar. After a brief discussion, the Committee approved in principle the proposal for the creation of an inter-university marine establishment and agreed that Dr. Dunbar be asked to continue to negotiations involved. The Academic Policy Committee noted that Professor Dunbar expected that the logical place for most of the money to come from, possibly all of it, would be research grants to faculty members and suggested that the University make no financial commitment to this project until more information is made available.

The Academic Policy Committee saw academic advantages in McGill participating in a marine station of this sort but felt that it could not take a final decision until more details are obtained.

184. PROPOSAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES FOR A ONE-YEAR POST-GRADUATE DIPLOMA:

At the request of the Chairman, Professor Stansbury spoke to the Committee. He reported that only students with a degree were permitted to enrol in this programme.

Professor Stansbury suggested referring this matter to the Subcommittee of the Academic Policy Committee on Diplomas at McGill requesting it to look into this matter and submit a report to the Academic Policy Committee as soon as possible. He added that this proposal did not follow the proposed scheme established by the Academic Policy Committee when submitting graduate programmes, and suggested that the proposal be tabled until the Academic Policy Committee gets some guidance from Professor Mallory. Professor Stansbury suggested that this item be placed on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Committee. All agreed.

185. FACULTY OF DIVINITY: B.D. CURRICULUM:

The Chairman reported that the document on the plans of the Faculty of Divinity for this term with regard to possible curriculum changes (Faculty of Divinity: B.D. Curriculum) had been circulated to the members of the Academic Policy Committee for their information.

186. "A NEW CONCEPT FOR MACDONALD COLLEGE":

The Chairman reported that this document was being

circulated to members of the Academic Policy Committee for information.

187. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Subcommittee on multi-disciplinary studies:

The Chairman reported that Dr. David Bates from the Faculty of Medicine was unable to serve on the Subcommittee of the Academic Policy Committee on multi-disciplinary studies. He invited the Committee to suggest another name as a replacement for Dr. David Bates.

Dr. MacIntosh suggested Dr. Melvill Jones from the Faculty of Medicine. The Committee agreed that the Chairman be asked to write to Dr. Jones inviting him to serve on this subcommittee.

b) Fifty-fourth Report of the Academic Policy Committee to Senate:

The Chairman reported that the Academic Policy Committee's Fifty-fourth Report to Senate, section I, had been approved by Senate at its meeting of February 5th, 1969.

The Chairman also reported that the Steering Committee of Senate had approved, in the name of Senate, the creation of the following subcommittees:

1. Subcommittee to look into the 12-month operation of the university.
2. A Subcommittee to examine for the university at large the implications of a credit system of promotion.

c) Letter from Mr. Andrew Allen:

The Chairman read a letter from Mr. Andrew Allen (Graduate Society of McGill University) to the Principal concerning a "Teacher of the year award".

After a brief discussion, the Academic Policy Committee suggested that the appropriate bodies to take this action were the Students' Council and the Graduate Society.

d) Letter from Mr. Robert Hajaly:

The Academic Policy Committee agreed that Mr. Norman Spector, Students' Council Director of University Affairs, receive a copy of the notice and Minutes of all the Academic Policy Committee meetings.

e) Proposal that the Department of Sociology and Anthropology be separated into two independent departments:

At the request of the Chairman, Professor Howard Roseborough spoke to the Committee. Professor Roseborough said that the two Departments—Department of Anthropology and Department of Sociology—were developing in different directions.

It was then MOVED by Professor Roseborough that the Department of Sociology and Anthropology be separated into two Departments—a Department of Sociology and a Department of Anthropology. This motion, seconded by Professor Stansbury, was voted upon and carried. The Committee agreed that this item be recommended to Senate.

f) Subcommittee on the use of the French language at McGill:

The Chairman reported that Professor John Trentman had expressed reluctance in accepting the Chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the use of the French language.

After a brief discussion, the Committee agreed that Professor John Trentman be persuaded to chair the above subcommittee. It was also agreed that Professor Donald Patterson from the Department of Chemistry be invited to serve on this Committee as a replacement for Professor Charles Taylor.

The meeting adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

Evening degree programme

A PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE EDUCATION PROGRAMME OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY TO THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PUBLIC OF MONTREAL

by Edward C. Webster,
director of Continuing Education

Introduction

The fact that the Province of Quebec now provides a very significant proportion of McGill operating income and this cannot be reversed, justifies a re-examination of our role in relation to English-speaking Montreal and Quebec. Change in McGill's role will occur and it is pertinent to ask "What kind of change do we want?" and "What control will we have over this change?" I suggest that at present we would have Government and public support for major changes that we initiate provided they increase our contribution to the education of English-speaking citizens of Greater Montreal.

Problem

McGill has been identified with research and teaching. The relative strength of each role has varied from time to time, from faculty to faculty and from department to department within faculties. Those faculties and departments that emphasized research had higher status: they were more widely known, they attracted more students from outside the local community, and research grants left them relatively independent of General Funds. The attention given teaching probably varies considerably from one department to another. Faculties and departments have had great freedom over the past fifteen to twenty years and the tendency has been to develop research and graduate studies. This emphasis has been compatible with the position of McGill as a university with an international reputation for excellence in professional schools and creativity in research. It could be defended so long as McGill was, in fact, a private university. Today, however, it is not an independent institution and its position must be re-examined to determine how it can maintain its reputation and, at the same time, be acceptable to the local community.

Dr. Murray B. Ross, President of York University, addressed the 1967 meeting of A.U.C.C. on "The University and Community Service". He introduced his address by drawing attention to the way the philosophy of North American Universities has been influenced to a greater or lesser degree by each of three Nineteenth Century traditions: (1) The German pattern embodied the idea of scientific research as a major if not the primary role of the university (2) The Oxford and Cambridge pattern embodied the principle of the university standing "in loco parentis" towards students and thereby responsible for the total development of the individual student. The university's and professor's responsibility went beyond the discovery of knowledge to its dissemination through effective teaching: teaching which was both a spur to intellectual development and, indirectly, in training in how to live. (3) The land grant movement in the United States initiated by passage of the Morrill Act of 1862. This gave impetus to the idea that the university must be practical and useful in its courses and that these must be available to all classes in society.

McGill developed in the Oxford and Cambridge tradition which worked well until after the Second World War when we grew too large. We were not organized around residential colleges nor did we have a tutorial system. Consequently many students have found themselves in completely impersonal environments that produce severe frustration. The rapid development of a research orientation (German pattern?) in post World War II years has not contributed positively to undergraduate education. There is no evidence that the land grant movement has exerted any

influence on the operation of McGill on the Montreal campus. (The Faculty of Agriculture on the other hand has from its inception made its facilities available to all classes of rural society.)

Procedures now being introduced at department, faculty, and Senate level should produce a much improved environment for undergraduate students and within a year or two the improvement should be evident to that part of the community that is represented at McGill.

The major remaining problem is to extend McGill in the tradition of the land grant universities to the broader English-speaking community. The Montreal campus of McGill today accepts no responsibility for university level education of anyone who has not been admitted as a candidate for a degree that will be earned during day time. Because of this we have lost the support of a large section of English-speaking Montreal.

Evidence

This lack of concern for the educational needs of the Montreal public can be documented:

1. Evening courses at McGill started in the 1920's as a way whereby staff members could earn a few extra dollars. The evening programme gradually became a way whereby the university could obtain sizable contributions for General Funds. Evening courses were offered to make money or, more accurately, to reduce deficits. Current policy is that evening study must pay all direct costs through fees and that any non-revenue producing educational programmes must be paid from evening course fees. (This year, for example, every person registered for an evening course contributes \$2.50 to rural education.)

2. Over 10,000 people (represented in 14,000 registrations) are attending evening courses. Some 300 evening instructors are divided roughly 50-50 between members of the McGill academic staff and part-time lecturers. The importance of this programme to the university community may be realized from what occurred when Senate was reorganized. At least two proposals for a new Senate contained no representation from the Centre for Continuing Education while the plan accepted provided that the Director of the Centre would have "voice without vote" although he is the sole representative of 10,000 part-time students and 150 part-time lecturers.

3. Most evening students have no access to any McGill library. Those who do have access pay a \$10.00 or \$15.00 annual fee for use of the Faculty of Engineering or the Faculty of Management library. None use the main library. Every set of criteria to judge the quality of university education, includes as one a measure of the nature and the extent of library facilities. Are evening students members of the McGill University educational community?

4. Senate has invited faculties to submit programmes of evening study leading to degrees. Only the Faculty of Management has shown any interest. On the other hand, teachers, through their professional associations, have requested the development of B.A. programmes in the evening. In what better way could McGill contribute to the improvement of elementary school education than by offering teachers the opportunity to obtain an undergraduate degree at night? Less than two years ago a Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science rejected this idea.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Senate accept a philosophy compatible with a late Twentieth Century land grant university and that McGill develop programmes to meet the needs for university level education of the English-speaking community. It is recommended that as a first step Senate instruct faculties to develop degree programmes of evening and summer study both on and off campus so that within five years McGill will offer the Montreal public the kind of educational opportunities available through practically every major university.

Five years is a realistic time space at the undergraduate level as we do not know how responsibility will be divided between CEGEPS and universities. There is no reason, however, for a five year delay at the graduate level. Such education is not the responsibility of CEGEPS and McGill is the one English-speaking Quebec university that has developed graduate programmes. It could offer appropriate Master's degree programmes in Engineering, Management, Arts and Science, and Education in the fall of 1969 or 1970 at the latest.

Acceptance of responsibility for such development implies acceptance of financial responsibility. Every programme of evening study should be subsidized by the university to the same extent that a comparable programme of day study is subsidized. Only in this way can McGill give evidence that it accepts its responsibility as a "public" university.

Summary

McGill must accept the fact that it is no longer "private" and must take the consequences: i.e. contribute substantially to the educational needs of working people in English-speaking Quebec. It is recommended that Senate strongly endorse a recommendation to broaden our educational effort immediately through development of evening graduate degree programmes and, as soon as possible, through programmes of evening study leading to undergraduate degrees. Senate is requested to instruct faculties to establish Committees to work out, in a minimum of time, ways to implement this policy.

February 19, 1969.

Statement from student senators

THIS STATEMENT WAS RELEASED BY STUDENT SENATORS ROBERT HAJALY, IAN HYMAN, NIGEL HAMER, PAUL CARON, HARRY EDEL AND PETER FOSTER FOLLOWING YESTERDAY'S SENATE MEETING.

We took our seats on Senate on October 31 of last year in a spirit of good faith, which we believed was shared by the majority of members of Senate. We were well aware that eight seats out of 62 could in no way be construed as substantial influence or control over decision-making, but it was our belief that it would be at least possible to have the basic issues before the university aired and discussed in a comprehensive fashion before action was taken.

We also presumed that the majority of members of Senate shared certain common aims towards basic democratization. The welcoming speech given to this year's freshman class by Principal Robertson was a major factor leading us to this presumption.

As time went on, it became increasingly and painfully apparent that these impressions on our part were incorrect, and that we are regarded as no more than second class citizens on Senate. Issues which we were elected on, issues which we consider to be of prime importance to the future well-being of the university were not even regarded as the proper business of Senate as the highest academic authority in the university.

Major items of concern were placed at the bottom of the agenda to give way to far more trivial items (such as the appointment of a university time-table co-ordinator). Many of the items we brought up at the first meeting have yet to be considered, for instance, several motions on Quebec education, questions of the authoritarian procedure of Senate, the entire question of university discipline which was considered of prime importance by Senate's own admission, aid to political refugees from the United States of America, etc.

Some of the issues which were forced on Senate were evaded in a very contemptuous fashion. The

most notable example of this was, of course, this august body's near-hysterical refusal to even consider the contract arrangements for Quebec's teachers, and its treatment of M. Raymond Laliberté, head of the largest teachers union in Quebec.

Issues which did finally come up, and they were few and far between, were rarely regarded seriously. On many occasions we were told they were irrelevant and out of place in Senate. When we presented a motion on the orientation of the university which derived from our platform almost word for word, we were insulted by all the leading administrative personnel of the university.

We were even berated by university representatives for our participation in the discussion of Senate business. Harry Woods counted up the number of times we spoke, and pointed to this as an impediment to the resolution of Senate business.

Finally, when a good number of the items we had presented were to come up for discussion, they were shuffled off to a special meeting of Senate over the Christmas holidays when no student was around to observe the proceedings. The lowest number of Senators ever showed up: most key administrators saw fit not to be present.

It is obvious to all but the majority of the distinguished faculty and administrators in this room that there exists a definite conflict of interest and perspective on Senate for the first time in its history. This conflict will take a good deal of time, effort and commitment on the part of Senators to resolve. Apparently, this commitment to the university does not exist here.

We have always been prepared for, and have in fact encouraged, extensive debate and more frequent meetings. Every adjournment motion has been carried against our votes. When Senate passed a motion resolving that it would discuss the issues, and we opposed its immediate subsequent adjournment, we were insulted by one member of Senate as "arrogant young so-and-so's".

If it is arrogant to insist on a discussion and resolution of the issues, gentlemen, then we stand condemned, and we suggest that there is little virtue in your humility.

The events of today's meeting and of the last week have demonstrated clearly the futility of our presence here. On television last week Rocke Robertson declared himself unilaterally and unconditionally opposed to basic democratization as it has been defined on this campus for the last few years.

Today Senate aligned itself with the Principal in his decision to proceed in this sham trial against Stanley Gray. You have in effect proved Gray's point and exonerated him before the entire university by concentrating on discipline and refusing to discuss the two most pressing issues before the university.

Gentlemen, you stand condemned by your own actions. We can no longer remain party to your hypocrisy and your reactionary position.

When the rest of Senate shows in some way its willingness to debate and take action on the issues before the university, we will be only too pleased to join with you. Until then, we can only have pity on you.

Allegiance of student senators

DECISION OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE STUDENTS' SOCIETY, 19 FEBRUARY, 1969

A petition was brought before the Committee for consideration and adjudication based on a motion duly passed by the Students' Council of McGill University, dated January 30, 1969. The Motion reads as follows:

Whereas the present student members of Senate derive their authority and the legitimacy of the office from the general student body; and

Whereas any proposed imposition of compulsory guidelines on Student Senators would at this time and for the above reasons involve legal and constitutional problems of both weight and complexity; Therefore be it resolved that this entire question be submitted to the Judicial Committee for study and consideration and that Council delay its actions until the findings of the above named Committee.

Seized of what is essentially a poorly-worded Reference, the Committee determined that the "question" submitted to it for consideration is whether the members of the Senate elected by and from the student body are subject to express and abide by the policy of the Students' Council in their capacity as "Student Senators".

Article 2 of the Constitution of the Students' Society subjects the Society to the "University Statutes and the jurisdiction of the Senate".

Article 8 vests governing authority of the Students' Society in the Students' Council.

The Senate alone possesses sovereign competence within the sphere of its jurisdiction. As it derives neither legitimacy or authority from the Students' Society vis-a-vis the latter, it alone is competent to determine its constitution and membership. While it may act in consultation and with advice from other bodies such as the Students' Council, it in no way abrogates its sovereignty in this respect, by doing so.

By a Senate Statute of Oct. 7, 1968, the composition of the Senate was to include *inter alia*:

"Eight students, one of whom shall come from Macdonald College, to be elected by the students." (emphasis added) [Art. V (1)]

The construction that must be attached to the crucial last phrase is that the Senate intended that there be a free election according to established principles of democracy, which include representation of and ultimate moral responsibility to the electorate.

It was on the basis of the aforementioned Statute alone that the Students' Council set into operation, by the resolution of October 9, 1968, the machinery for the election of "Student Senators".

Where may it be said that a nexus or a scintilla of control exists between the Student's Council and the popularly elected senators?

Once elected, Student Senators become "University Authorities" within the meaning of Article VIII (1)—independent, full-fledged members of the Senate. At the same time, they maintain membership in the Students' Society, which is merely an incorporated entity whose powers are circumscribed by its Constitution, by-laws, and letters-Patent.

In this respect, the position of a Student Senator may be said to possess a double-aspect. There is nothing inherently inimical, contradictory, or self-defeating in this dual status, as for the purposes of sitting on Senate, the Student Senator is merely a "student" of the University as opposed to a member of the Students' Society. This latter proposition is self-evident from the wording of Article V (1) of the Senate Statute of October 7, 1968.

As such Article VIII (1) of the Constitution of the Students' Society is of no relevance.

Finally, it must be concluded, that the jurisdictions of the Senate and the Students' Society as governed by the Students' Council are both distinct and mutually exclusive.

To reiterate, the object of the Students' Society as consecrated in Article II of its own constitution is to exercise control of "the student activities" and not "the student's activity". It was never intended that the Students' Council should or could impose a monolithic order within the polyglottic setting of the University.

In answer to the question posed by this reference, the Committee finds that the Student Senators owe their sole allegiance to their constituents, as it is presumed that it was upon their own platform and not that of Council, that they were elected.

February 19, 1969.

University planning and co-ordination

The Conference of Rectors and Principals of Quebec universities, at its meeting of last January 17, decided to submit to the approval of Senate, Councils or other university bodies, a procedure for appraisal of graduate degree programmes. This decision is the result of a recommendation put forward by the Conference's Committee of Vice-Principals (Academic).

The Appraisals Committee shall consist of five members. At the outset, the duration of its mandate will be of three years. The function of this Committee is to evaluate and appraise new or existing graduate degree programmes. Such an assessment may be undertaken at the request of a Quebec university as regards this university's programmes or at the request of the Conference of Rectors and Principals with the consent of the university concerned.

The university wishing to have a programme appraised by the Appraisals Committee will submit the following information to it: an estimate of student enrolment over a period of five years; the number of present and future staff; the extent and limits of the proposed areas of specialization, available research facilities, etc., in connection with the proposed programme.

The Appraisals Committee will call on one or several consultants (some of whom will be from outside the Province of Quebec) known as outstanding scholars in the field of study of the proposed programme. The consultants will visit the university and will submit reports in writing to the Appraisals Committee. The Appraisals Committee will examine the report, will meet with representatives of the university concerned, and will then recommend the granting or refusal of a new programme, or the retention or suspension of an existing programme.

Before reaching a decision, the Conference will make sure that a thorough and fair study of the case, has been conducted; it may, if necessary, refer the matter to the Committee of Vice-Principals (Academic) for its opinion on problems of coordination, duplication or other similar matters.

The Conference wishes and hopes that all universities will agree to follow this appraisal procedure. According to the Conference, such a mechanism should help Quebec universities reach new levels of coordination and excellence.

Policy for University Libraries Committee

AS APPROVED BY STUDENTS' COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 12, 1969

1. WHEREAS the McLennan Library was financed by the taxpayers of Quebec; and
WHEREAS the upkeep of McGill's entire library system is financed in like manner; and
WHEREAS all segments of society who support the system should benefit directly as well as indirectly from it, and this service not be confined to graduates of McGill and to certain corporations;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that any member of the community, upon payment of a \$5.00 library fee, be entitled to full use of the facilities of McGill's library system, except borrowing privileges and books on reserve.

2. BE IT RESOLVED that Students' Council
i) Accept the principle that the library should be open

round-the-clock for purposes of using books in the library building, as presently practised in several large American universities;

ii) Strongly request the Director of Libraries and his staff to give immediate priority to studying the cost of implementing such a proposal;

iii) Demands that the University Libraries Committee establish a policy on this subject at its next meeting.

3.

WHEREAS the efficient operation of the libraries requires the active co-operation of all segments of the University community; and

WHEREAS reserve book lists are crucial, in most courses, for the learning process;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that any professor who submits a book list later than the May 30 for full courses and for first term half courses; or later than the September 15 for second term half courses, should be subject to such penalty as is determined by the Director of Libraries.

4.

WHEREAS the Faculty of most individual departments now order books pertaining to their disciplines unilaterally; and

WHEREAS this practice is clearly incompatible with the concept of democratisation as favoured by this Council;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Libraries Committee support the establishment of Departmental Library Committees structured on a parity basis, to set priorities in ordering books.

Academic announcements

University Scholarships Committee

The University Scholarships Committee will conduct open meetings. The next meeting of the committee is on Thursday, March 13, 2:15 in the Council Room of the Arts Building.

Inter-university research group in "infra-literature"

Literary criticisms as well as the traditional forms of literary history and sociology of literature have left unexplored one vast area of writing and narrative fiction: that of the so-called "dime-novel", nurse novel, pornographic epic, etc.—the "infra-literature" to which may be added other more or less marginal forms of expression, such as the comic strip or the "photo-roman", where language combines itself with other semiological systems.

A few scholars have made explanatory ventures into those "terrae incognitae", but it would seem that the study of "infra-literature" challenges in too serious a way our cultural myths and the very value of our methods in literary criticism, for this sort of research to have been yet systematic or productive on a large scale. Traditional, elite-oriented forms of literature still constitute a well-protected closed circuit. Around the unending critical commentary that permeates all cultural activities, there remains a wide, silent zone.

It must, therefore, be realized that either by means of an "internal" approach or through the "external" point of view of sociology or psychology, the study of "infra-literature" is most likely to question the essential aspects of the prevailing cultural ideologies. An inter-university research centre in para-literature

has recently been created in Montreal, with the active participation of faculty members from the four main institutes of higher education in the city.

The centre invites all those who are interested in participating in its activities to contact: *Professor Marc Angenot, Department of French Language and Literature, McGill University (392-4484).*

Woodrow Wilson Fellowship winners

Among the designates of Woodrow Wilson National Fellowships this year were seven McGill students. They are:

John B. Burbidge, economics; Gordon M. Cohen, chemistry; Michel Del Buono, economics; Peter M. Doubilet, mathematics; Stephen M. Miller, economics; Sheldon M. Schreter, sociology; and Stephen M. Tanny, mathematics.

The Foundation also announced that the following McGill students are on its *Honorable Mention* list:

Mark Aronoff, linguistics; Normand Briere, economics; Susan M. Dalfen, psychology; Lucy A. Fellowes, art history; Robert H. Frender, psychology; Harvey Goldblatt, Russian language; Harvey M. Israelovitch, anthropology; Peter G. Rodger, Canadian or American government; and Alfred Walczewski, dramatic literature.

Designates' names will be submitted to graduate schools with the recommendation that they be considered for financial support.

Recommendation for dismissal of Stanley Gray

The letter sent to Mr. Stanley Gray this morning has been widely distributed on the campus from a source unknown to us. While in the spirit of confidentiality implied in the Canadian Association of University Teachers (C.A.U.T.) statement we had no intention of having this matter made public, we feel bound, in these new circumstances, to make a statement:

The letter reads as follows:

"February 11, 1969.

"To: Mr. Stanley Gray
Dept. of Economics & Political Science
McGill University.

Please be advised that we are satisfied that there is adequate cause to justify our recommending that you should be dismissed from the University. Before we do so, however, you are invited to meet with us, together with the Head of your Department, Professor James R. Mallory, and the Vice-President of the M.A.U.T. Professor Trevor Lloyd in Room 388, Macdonald Engineering Building, at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 13, 1969, in an attempt to settle the matter. You are entitled to bring with you to the meeting and be assisted by an advisor of your choice.

Please be further advised that if this attempt to settle the matter should fail we intend to invite you to agree in writing with the University to arbitrate the question in accordance with the C.A.U.T. Policy Statement on Academic Appointments and Tenure Paragraphs C-1 to C-9 inclusive published in the C.A.U.T. Bulletin, Volume 16, No. 3 of February 1968 a copy of which is enclosed for your information.

(signed) H. Rocke Robertson

Principal

(signed) H. D. Woods
Dean of Arts and Science"

No comment can be made now upon the details of the case or the facts that led to the decision to introduce these procedures but the following facts can be released:

1. No charge has been laid. This letter invites Mr.

Gray to attend a meeting on February 13, 1969 to discuss the whole problem and to see if some settlement can be reached.

2. If no settlement can be reached a charge will be laid and Mr. Gray will be invited to agree to have the case heard by a Board of Arbitration composed of 3 Professors from outside the University. This Board would be established by agreement between Mr. Gray and the representatives of the University or, if agreement cannot be reached, it would be appointed by an individual agreed upon by a joint Committee of the M.A.U.T. and other representatives of the University.

3. This procedure was developed by the Committee on Academic Appointments and Tenure of the Canadian Association of University Teachers and was (according to the C.A.U.T. Policy Statement) "the result of many months of work by the Committee, done in the light of its experience in connection with the cases that have come before it through a number of years, as well as of comment, criticism, and suggestion from many sources, especially from faculty associations."

The procedure was adopted officially by the C.A.U.T. Council in November 1967 and represents the only relevant guide from the Canadian academic community that we have to follow at the present time and we are prepared to adopt it for this particular case.

Office of the Principal, February 11, 1969

McGill Computer Centre moves

Because of the occupation of the computer room at Sir George Williams University, the University took steps a week or more ago to increase the security of the Data Centre, where payroll cheques for staff, including union workers, were prepared. As a result of the destruction of the Sir George Williams computers yesterday, similar arrangements were immediately provided at the Computer Centre in the Engineering Building, where teaching and research computer work is done.

Last week, the smallest computer, the 360/50 was moved downtown but this move was not related in any way to the destruction of the Sir George Williams equipment. The new computer centre has become congested, and room had to be made for the expansion of the 360/75 computer, which is operated in batch-mode; the computer which was moved is a time-shared computer whose location is unimportant for its operation. It has been placed adjacent to the McGill Financial Research Institute in the CNR complex downtown, where we have the added advantage of the availability of operators to staff the machine. W. D. Thorpe, director.

February 12, 1969

Scholarships

McGILL FACULTY OF DIVINITY—
NEIL STEWART PRIZE

\$50 annual prize, awarded on the basis of an examination open to students of the Faculty of Divinity and of the Presbyterian College. The examination will be on translation, grammar, and syntax of assigned passages of prose, prophecy, and poetry totalling about 25 chapters of the Hebrew Bible, together with Davidson's Hebrew grammar. The passages selected for 1969 are: II Samuel 1-11, Isaiah 40-48, Psalms 21-27. Names of entrants with addresses or telephone numbers should be submitted to the office of the Dean of Divinity. Deadline—March 7.

CIL FELLOWSHIPS FOR POSTGRADUATE
STUDIES IN WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT
\$1,200, plus a \$300 grant to the university, and

summer grants of \$1,000, are available to university graduates undertaking post-graduate studies in wildlife management at a Canadian university, and who are intending to follow a career in Canada. All phases of wildlife management that apply to game animals and game birds are subjects for study. Interested students should contact the Registrar. Deadline—March 15.

CANADIAN—SCANDINAVIAN FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIPS

Living and tuition expenses for postgraduate studies and research in Sweden during the academic year 1969-1970. Other scholarships available to students or teachers attending the 1969 session of the International Summer School, University of Oslo, Norway. Send information on past studies, on the proposed work in Sweden or Norway, as well as transcripts and a passport-type photo to: Dr. Jan Lundgren, Secretary c/o Geography Dept., McGill University, Montreal. Deadline—March 25.

LORD BEAVERBROOK SCHOLARSHIPS IN LAW
\$2,500 per year to students with a B.A., B.Sc., B.B.A., or equivalent degree, tenable at the Faculty of Law of the University of New Brunswick, in the first academic year of the course leading to a Bachelor of Civil Law degree. Applications forms and information at Registrar's office. Deadline—March 31.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP

\$1,000 for study leading to a Master's or Doctoral degree. Tenable at University of Windsor, for one academic year. Applications can be obtained from: Office of Graduate Studies, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario. Deadline—April 15.

CANADIAN-ITALIAN STUDENTS SCHOLARSHIPS

The Canadian-Italian Business & Professional Men's Association grants yearly scholarships to the most meritorious students of Italian origin or descent. Application forms and further information from the Registrar. Deadline—May 31.

A & S position on CEGEPs

SUPPORT FOR A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAMME

by E. R. Pounder

1. The motion to undertake a four-year transitional programme of collegial studies represents a major reversal of Faculty policy. This paper attempts to review the history of discussions on collegial studies and to explain the reasons for introducing this motion.

2. A Senate committee, after long study of the problems of transition to the CEGEP and three-year university system, recommended to Senate in February 1967 that the best solution appeared to be conversion of the present programmes in the Faculty of Arts and Science to five-year programmes, with a gradual phasing-out of the first two (collegial) years over a four- or five-year period as CEGEPs opened.

3. During the 1967-68 session this proposal was discussed in Departments, Divisions, and Faculties. In March 1968 the Senate Committee on Collegial Studies reaffirmed its support of this proposal as the best available solution, and Professor Pounder and Vice-Principal Oliver so reported to the meeting of Faculty on April 10, 1968. However, Faculty at that meeting passed by a vote of 27 to 20 a resolution rejecting the five-year programme and proposing continuation of a four-year programme with gradual reduction in the number of "freshman" places.

4. An additional factor arose in the summer of

1968, with a strong recommendation from the Department of Education in Quebec that the McGill Faculty of Education be moved to the Montreal campus. That Faculty supported the recommendation, with reasonable reservations as to the adequacy of space. As a result, an ad hoc group appointed by the Principal drafted a "package deal" on the move of Education, a "one-generation" collegial programme at McGill, and the possibility of leasing part of Macdonald College for a CEGEP. This proposal was presented to the Department of Education on November 9, 1968, and the offering of collegial training for one generation was approved in principle by Faculty at its meeting of November 29, 1968 by a vote of 62 to 22.

5. Negotiations with the Department of Education have been painfully slow but it is now fair to say that all of the assurances asked for in the letter of January 30, 1969, from Vice-Principal Oliver to M. Yves Martin, have been received. However, Faculty will recall that the telegram from M. Martin, read by Vice-Principal Oliver at its special meeting of February 4, 1969, raised for the first time the possibility of two generations of collegial students. This was developed in more detail at a meeting in Quebec on February 13. The Department does *not* see how to create enough places in college or college-equivalent programmes in the years 1970-1972 unless McGill offers some space in each of those years for E1 students. We are thus asked to offer a four-generation transitional programme rather than one for one generation.

6. This proposal has been examined by the Committee on Collegial Studies which reached a unanimous recommendation essentially the same as in the motion to be presented. A number of alternatives were considered and rejected.

(a) *Continuation of four-year programmes.* The advantages are obvious but the disadvantages are great—disparity of course length with Dawson College and probably Sir George Williams University is a major one. Also, it is clear that such a procedure would meet with strong opposition from Quebec and would lead to a confrontation in which it might be difficult to enlist public support for the McGill position.

(b) *Accept collegial students for 1969* and negotiate procedure for subsequent years. The Committee felt this "open-ended" alternative much worse than a decision on a definite phasing-out plan.

(c) *Accept no collegial students in 1969 and subsequently.* This is impossible in 1969 because McGill has stated that it will accept a "freshman" class of about the present size. If followed later it could lead to very sharp dips in enrolment.

7. Offering a college-equivalent programme to be phased-out over four or five years has advantages which have been reported earlier to Faculty. Briefly, they are:

(a) it provides a response to a duty McGill has to provide educational opportunities to Quebec high-school graduates who would otherwise have no place to go. Failure to provide these opportunities could result in considerable pressure from the public and the Government.

(b) it provides for an essentially stable student population of about 13,500 to 14,500 on the Montreal campus in 1969 to 1974, which would tend to stabilize the size of Departmental staffs at about present levels.

(c) the one-generation plan has already led to curricular problems. Substantial modification of present courses for one year only would be an imposition on professors and departments. Yet merely to rearrange existing courses makes equivalence with the college programme difficult to achieve. A four-year collegial programme would justify more innovation, with the probability of influencing more strongly the CEGEP programme.

8. The dangers of undertaking an extended transition plan have also been discussed at length in Faculty, especially the potentially explosive growth in undergraduate population if the transition lasted more than four years, and the risk of an imbalance between numbers of collegial students and upper year students. The motion attempts to deal with both of these problems.

9. It is recommended that the decision be made unilaterally because an immediate decision is needed. The Registrar's Office and the Admissions Office are being besieged with enquiries from students who rightly want to know whether they will enter McGill in September 1969 for a four-year or a five-year course. To obtain guarantees from Quebec relating to an extended transitional scheme would probably take weeks or months, if indeed the Government would feel it could commit itself for future years.

February 24, 1969

A & S position on CEGEPs

SUPPORT FOR A FOUR-YEAR PROGRAMME

by J. C. Weldon

The place of McGill in the educational system of Quebec, we think, is like that of Laval and the University of Montreal. It is a university proper, providing in particular advanced undergraduate training and work in graduate studies and research. As educational reform proceeds, and the system is widened to make higher education freely available, McGill should maintain its academic excellence and its specialization in advanced teaching and research. This is the natural and efficient use of our resources, and very far from a defensive and selfish response to change. Over the years a staff has been recruited and buildings and equipment acquired fitted to the work of a university proper. Their redeployment to collegial studies would be costly. Their use there for a protracted time would be extravagantly wasteful. Their availability for university work again would be unlikely, first because as time passes these resources would be less and less suited for university work, and second because with McGill's resources diverted to collegial instruction the need for genuine expansion of the educational system would be disguised. With the system in fact expanding, the need for centres of advanced training must correspondingly grow, calling for the full use of McGill's resources (and those of Laval and the University of Montreal) to meet that need.

With the introduction of the collegial years there is, of course, a difficult transition to be dealt with, and especially in the English-language part of the system. A year of schooling has been added, even now no college actually exists though Dawson College is promised, and collegial education is to be "free" (a major reform but one that implies an abrupt increase in numbers): these facts exclude any simple transition. In considering how McGill should adapt, though, surely our duty to the community is to decide *objectively* how our resources can best be used, and to base our public relations on the merits of the case, meeting mistaken preconceptions by persuasion.

The Faculty's position, taken on April 10th last, was in brief that McGill should continue to be a "four year" university during transition, withdrawing gradually from the present first year as places in true CEGEPs become available. We believe that Faculty was right in April, and should return to the position it then held. The alternative the administration persuaded it to consider in November has now been discredited, and the substitute the administration brings to us to-day asks Faculty to abandon con-

ditions judged indispensable only two weeks ago.

The only important matter, of course, is not the vagaries of the debate, but the question of whether the position of April 10th was correct. As we interpret the position, it would use our resources in an efficient and equitable way. We would be doing the things we can do well, and would be withdrawing from old arrangements as rapidly as new arrangements and new facilities become available. We could reasonably expect a protracted and so gradually changing period of transition, and would not be tied to predictions of the unpredictable in numbers and years. We would be living with the facts as they actually materialized. During the coming years we would give our energies to curricular reforms of long run value, and above all, next year to the redesign of what is now second year and will eventually be the first year of the post-collegial university. There we would want to create very flexible arrangements, multisection courses, options adapted to particular backgrounds, and perhaps special tutorial facilities, designed so that we could provide continuity for students from our own first year, from the two collegial years, for students with suitable qualifications from the first of the collegial years, for transfer students, and for students from the French-language CEGEPs. Dealing with things as they happen we can adapt to the reality of what is taught at Dawson College and the other true CEGEPs, whether it be more or less than the provisional programmes intend.

As to the payment of fees, McGill can only recommend to the government that students coming to first year here have their fees paid, for they will be coming here only because places in CEGEPs are not available and only until they are. The government would bear even higher costs if CEGEPs did exist, and cannot in reason transfer their burden to the students. But unreasonable things happen: if fees are charged, then McGill must do what it can to multiply first year bursaries so that entry here is as little dependent on income as we can make it. The situation is very different, notice, if we follow the administration's proposal, and not only collect fees in unspecified amounts (perhaps \$400 a year) for two years, but also impose the living costs of the extra year on our campus. The Administration's proposal has real costs and uses real resources; it uses these resources in a wasteful way in just that period when new demands make waste especially painful.

If Faculty returns to its position of April 10th, in making our case to the public, there should not, we think, be sulkily asides about the difficulties of getting clear understandings from Quebec. We would have chosen the position because it was, objectively, the best position, and not something we have been driven to by an unsympathetic government. To argue otherwise is indeed to invite a confrontation with the government, and to make a bad case out of a good one in our report to the public.

The Administration's Proposal

What comes to mind in reading the supporting argument to the administration's notice of motion is the enquiry after the assassination, "Yes, Mrs. Lincoln, but apart from that, how did you like the show?" We are to focus on details after the essentials have disappeared. The fundamental conditions of only a few weeks ago have been let go: instead of "one generation" there are to be "four generations," and instead of guarantees there is to be a unilateral commitment by McGill because "to obtain guarantees from Quebec relating to an extended transitional scheme would probably take weeks or months, if indeed the Government would feel it could commit itself for future years."

Even on the details the assurances do not seem complete. No doubt during the afternoon the documentation will be extended, but at the moment it is not clear to what the government is bound and

whether whatever government commitments there are lapse once McGill moves unilaterally. And are the assurances satisfactory in detail? Has the government promised capital funds for *education* on the scale asked for and at the stipulated times? What documents are there on the changes of mind at the Department of Education on the one, two and four generations? Presumably fees are not to be the once asked for "zero", but have they been substantially reduced below the once unacceptable \$400 or more? And what is the documentation that assures academic autonomy in collegial teaching for the four generations or for whatever time collegial teaching is done on campus?

The all important fact, though, is the wastefulness and almost certain irreversibility of the proposal now contemplated. We were, as a Faculty, persuaded to go from zero to one generation of collegial students, have been recently told of the possibility of two generations and are now asked to accept four, and to accept four without any guarantees — "n" is tending rapidly to infinity. Two years from now, with 3,500 collegial students on campus, with the administrative apparatus adapted to collegial patterns, the forces from the public, from the government, from the changed campus itself, will compel us to continue the "mixed" institution we have created for any number of years to come, and will compel us with some logic and justice, for we will have changed the function of McGill and it will be eventually wasteful, perhaps, to change it back. Moreover, it is naive to imagine that we can be assured of academic autonomy as the collegial arrangements become permanent. The notion is mistaken, we think, that we can or indeed should have a privileged position in which our near-CEGEP will be free from the central supervision the true CEGEPs must accept.

The administration's scheme is wasteful. It is wasteful of staff and of facilities brought together for one purpose (and a purpose of growing importance) to divert them to a different purpose. Recruitment will soon reflect such a change in function, and some of the staff now here may drift away not in protest but simply because their place is in a university proper. The students will be ill-served, partly because of McGill's deliberate acceptance of an unfair fee structure but even more because of the real costs of the extra year. The community will be ill-served because of the misuse of our resources.

February 24, 1969.